

REMARKS

Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-13 and 32-39 will be pending in the application. Applicant has canceled withdrawn claims 14-31 from the application and reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of these claims. Applicant has also added new claims 32-39 to the application. No claim fees are believed to be due.

In the Office Action of July 7, 2003, claims 1, 5-7 and 10-13 were rejected and objections were issued in regards of claims 2-4, 8, and 9. The Office Action also set forth that claims 4 and 9 contain allowable subject matter. In response, Applicant has amended claims 4 and 9 to be in independent form to obtain immediate allowance. The original scope of claims 4 and 9 has not been narrowed because they incorporate the original form of claim 1 (claim 4) and claims 1 and 8 (claim 9).

Applicant provides the following comments to the Office Action.

Election/Restriction

Applicant confirms the election of Group I, original claims 1-13.

Specification

To obviate this objection, Applicant has amended the Abstract as requested by the Examiner. Some minor amendments were also made to the specification to replace the term “means” with “mechanism” on pages 11 and 12.

Claim Objections

Claims 2, 3, and 8 are objected to as being in improper dependent form. The Examiner asserts that these claims fail to define further structural limitations. Applicant has amended these claims and respectfully submits that the claims are now in proper dependent form.

Claims 6, 11, and 12 are objected to because of minor typographical errors. These claims have been amended to correct the spelling of “device”.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5-7, and 10-13 are rejected as being anticipated by Honda (US 5,873,177, assigned to Tokyo Electron Limited, the owner of the present application).

Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection should be withdrawn because Honda fails to inherently or explicitly disclose every feature of the claimed invention, which is apparent when comparing independent claim 1 to Honda.

For example, the following two features of claim 1 are not shown in Honda:

1. a posture changing mechanism located outside of the process chamber for changing the posture of said substrate rotating device outside of said process chamber such that a state of the substrate held by said holder changes between substantially vertical and substantially horizontal; and
2. a position adjusting mechanism for relatively adjusting the positions of said process chamber and said substrate rotating device such that said holder is housed in said process chamber.

From reviewing the disclosure of Honda and the accompanying figures (e.g. Figure 2), it is apparent that what would be Honda’s posture changing mechanism is located inside the alleged process chamber. The Office Action sets forth that reference numbers 30 and 69 are the

- process chamber and that reference numbers 10a and 10b are the posture changing mechanism.

Applicant notes no disclosure regarding the alleged posture changing mechanism being capable of changing the position of a substrate rotating device outside of the process chamber. Hence, Honda fails to inherently or explicitly disclose that the posture of the substrate rotating device will be changed outside of the process chamber.

Further, the alleged position adjusting mechanism of Honda does not relatively adjust the positions of said process chamber and said substrate rotating device, such that said holder is housed in said process chamber.

Similar failings exist when comparing independent claim 2 and Honda.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 5-7, and 10-13 are not anticipated by Honda.

New Claims

Newly added claims 32-37 should be allowable because of their dependency. Support for these claims can be found in the specification and the originally filed claims.

Applicant also submits that independent claims 38 and 39 are allowable in view of the cited prior art. Claim 38 is present in 112, 6th paragraph format, which incorporates features set forth in the specification. Claim 39 provides further structural detail of the cleaning unit that is disclosed in the specification, for example, pages 21-24. It is believed that the structure set forth in claim 39 patentably differs from the structure disclosed in the cited prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this response, such as fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 02-4300. Any overpayment can be credited to Deposit Account No. 02-4300.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 7, 2003

Signature:



Michael A. Makuch, Reg. No. 32,263
Smith, Gambrell & Russell, L.L.P.
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 659-2811

SGRDC/204831.1